



EVERY HIT A HOME RUN:
BROUGHTON INTERNATIONAL AND “FABERGE”

Diane Goldman

Submission for the Museum Studies Writing Requirement
and
consideration for the Malero Award Spring 2001
written for Curatorial Research and Planning, MSTD 270 - Fall 2000

EVERY HIT A HOME RUN:
BROUGHTON INTERNATIONAL AND “FABERGE”

Imagine, as a curator, if each exhibit you scripted had to be a home run--a smashing success each and every time. Pressure? You bet. In fact, that challenge faces the curator at Broughton International, where President James E. Broughton, a former professional baseball player, is well acquainted with the importance of home runs. A home run in the world of exhibits is called a “blockbuster,” and that is Broughton’s specialty. The company’s most recent blockbuster, “Faberge,” opened September 2000 in the Wilmington, Delaware, Riverfront Arts Center. What questions do such exhibits by “blockbuster mills” (Rosenbaum, 1998) raise?

Blockbusters

Blockbusters are exhibitions (often large-scale, often traveling) that attract people not otherwise disposed to visit a museum. Victoria Alexander’s book Museums and Money (1996) analyzes recent changes in exhibition style and defines blockbusters by two characteristics--public expectation, indicated by advance ticket sales, and public response, indicated by high attendance and long lines to enter the exhibit or buy tickets. Such exhibitions are scaled to exceed the scope of any single collection; they bring together objects from a variety of lenders and institutions. The term comes from the invasive impact of such exhibitions on their sponsoring institutions, like that of the neighbor-hood-devastating World War II “blockbuster bombs” (Volkert, 1991). This exhibit phenomenon arose in the post-1965 museum shift from a focus on collection development to encouraging public interaction with collections (Volkert, *ibid.*; Anderson 1992). At the same time, the Metropolitan Museum of Art introduced reciprocal loan arrangements with European museums, increasing the access of U.S. museums to a world of new materials (Gross, 1998, quoting former Met director Thomas Hoving). The financial potential for such loan-heavy blockbusters emerged in 1977, when the King Tut tour revealed how media coverage could combine with public curiosity to produce previously unimagined numbers of visitors for a museum exhibit.

Blockbuster response is attendance above 400,000 (Evertz, 2000), though for some museums “even” 300,000 may be an extraordinary number (Rosenbaum, *ibid.*). That level of success and publicity is seductive for museums that find themselves increasingly dependent on private and corporate donations. In fact, blockbusters arose at a time when museums first faced a confluence of facilities needing expensive renovations and soaring prices for acquisitions--in short, they needed more funds (Harris, 1999). Despite increased government mechanisms for support, expenses have continued to rise, with a matching dependence on earned income (McLean, 1999; Noriega, 1999; Weil, 1999). Blockbusters are intended to produce some of that income.

Blockbusters attract new visitors--potential sources of income in the form of memberships, retail sales, or even donations. To the extent that such shows increase repeat visits by those already attracted to museums, the blockbuster is a reward to those already inclined to provide financial support. Strong attendance can be used as an argument in applications for federal or corporate support. There are, however, arguments against blockbusters, particularly the amount of time and money required to stage them--resources taken from other museum activities. Increased attendance or even increased financing does not mean that all exhibit costs will be recovered. The exhibits studied for this paper require attendance of almost 500,000 before they begin to show a profit (Gazella, 1997). Of course, many “ordinary” exhibits are not self-supporting and may be funded in part from museum operating funds. But blockbusters devour huge amounts of museum resources and, even if the exhibition is “self-supporting,” increased attendance puts demands on other parts of the museum infrastructure, such as security, maintenance, or even administration. Of course, if attendance does not increase as anticipated, the financial risks of unrecovered exhibit costs are even greater. Loan arrangements must still be fulfilled. Insurance payments must still be met. Interestingly enough, in the late 1980's blockbusters were considered such a financial risk for museums that John McDonald (1992) posited the “Death of the Blockbuster.” He noted that even without a financial loss, the blockbuster was “either a failure for the viewer or a failure for the gallery, a hopeless melee in front of the work or a financial debacle for the venue.” Apparently, he did not convince the museum industry that blockbusters were doomed. By 1995, G. Donald Adams refers to museums as “economic generators.” And *Daedalus*' 1999 museum issue (looking at U.S. museums in particular) felt compelled to ask whether museums were so focused on special

exhibitions (and other income-producing ventures) that they were losing their “primacy as centers of research and learning.”

Broughton

Blockbusters are big business, and James Broughton recognized that fact. Those within Broughton International say that the organization has one purpose only--exposing U.S. citizens to cultures from around the world, regardless of the economics. They locate venues to bring “the greatest art from the greatest institutions in the world,” and so provide an educational opportunity for hundreds of thousands at all age levels (J. Broughton; M. Broughton). Nonetheless, the financial numbers are staggering. Dun and Bradstreet’s most recent listings show Broughton International as a exhibition operator with a staff of 173 and sales of \$10 millions (Dun & Bradstreet, 1999). The 400,000-plus visitors attending a blockbuster spend far more than just the ticket cost during their museum trip, generating hundreds of millions of dollars for the community (Evertz, *ibid*), including neighboring museums (A. Combs). The firm has been a key player in the urban revitalization projects of St. Petersburg, Florida, and Wilmington, Delaware. It is easy to forget that exhibitions lie at the heart of these heavy financial responsibilities. Does the financial and legal wrangling impact exhibit quality? Or has Broughton simply drawn from 19th-century commercial peep shows and 20th-century amusement parks?

The firm, begun in 1994, is private and classified loosely by the U.S. Department of Commerce as specializing in miscellaneous amusement and recreation (Dun & Bradstreet, *ibid*). It’s declared purpose is “developing and producing . . . grand-scale international exhibitions” (Broughton Web site). The board of directors consists of Broughton relatives (Dun & Bradstreet, *ibid*).⁽¹⁾ Broughton “Sr.” realized the educational and economic potential of exhibitions while serving as a civic administrator in Memphis, Tennessee, 1984-91 (Broughton bio, Faberge-exhibition Web site). As Cultural Affairs Director and eventually City Chief of Staff, Broughton participated in forming an international cultural exchange program entitled WONDERS: The Memphis International Cultural Series--a producer of traveling exhibitions. The very first WONDERS exhibition, Ramesses the Great, brought Memphis \$88 million and 675,000 visitors (J. Broughton; WONDERS Web site). At the same time, Memphis was competing for a National Football League franchise, and Broughton astutely compared economic

arguments. Attendance and money similar to the Ramesses windfall could be generated only by acquiring a football team with a completely sold-out season, which would require hundreds of millions of dollars of city investment in stadium and transportation construction. Investment required for the exhibition program was a (single) hundred million dollars, financed by private, rather than municipal backers. Broughton easily determined exhibitions were the more economical alternative (J. Broughton).⁽²⁾

About 1993, Broughton was invited to oversee development of the Florida International Museum as part of the revitalization program for downtown St. Petersburg, Florida. In 1994 he incorporated Broughton International as a for-profit St. Petersburg-based firm specializing in miscellaneous amusement and recreation (a broad Standard Industry Code classification also including museums). The firm's purpose was to provide a cultural exchange program for the museum, which opened in 1995. As in Memphis, successful programs generated attendance and income to undeniable effect. The museum has estimated that during their heaviest visitation, nearby retail sales increased by up to \$200,000/month (Rogers, 1999b). Development of St. Petersburg's downtown shopping plaza is attributed to the presence of the Florida International Museum (Gilmer, 2000, quoting developer Mel Sembler). Though effective, not all of the Museum's programs were sufficiently successful, and as losses grew, controversy developed over the division of profits (see Postscript). In 1996, Broughton resigned as director of the Florida International Museum and was invited to work his magic in Wilmington, Delaware.

Broughton International oversaw the design of Wilmington's Riverfront Arts Center with support from the governor of Delaware, city and state authorities, and son Matthew Broughton as Vice President of Operations. The Center anchors redevelopment of Wilmington's Christina River frontage--formerly a contaminated industrial area--an attraction planned to draw people from 60 miles away and contain 400,000 square feet of retail space (Carlson, 1998). The \$10 million Center as planned is an exhibitor's dream--125,000 square feet renovated from a ship assembly building, including 25,000 square feet of exhibit space, a theater seating 275, an internal workshop. (The lack of promised internal storage space--among other disputes--led Broughton to sue Wilmington's Riverfront Development Corporation (RDC) in late 1999. See Postscript.) The redevelopment followed a succession of annual

city deficits (1991-95) and an emphasis on the need for change. One article calls the Center's exhibits "a sophisticated treasure . . . in a city whose tourism industry still toils in the gritty remains of plain old industry" (Brown, 1998). Riverfront Development was established and charged with gathering private money to carry out redevelopment of the Wilmington Riverfront pursuant to action by the Delaware legislature (Broughton v. Riverfront, 1999). The legislative instructions were explicitly part of an effort to turn the economy by bringing local residents back to the city's urban areas and drawing day visitors from the surrounding states of Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania ("Delaware Governor . . .," 1998; Sills, 2001).⁽³⁾

Faberge ⁽⁴⁾

An exhibition entitled "Faberge" opened at the Riverfront Center in September 2000. After a 6-month run, the exhibition's over 1,000 objects are scheduled to visit at least one other location (as yet undefined, in part because of the footage required, which includes 8,000 square feet of retail space compared to an average in traditional museums of 500 square feet (M. Broughton)). Unlike the 1996 "Faberge in America" exhibit organized by a consortium of museums, the current exhibit was organized by Broughton Masterpiece Presentation--a subsidiary of the privately held, for-profit corporation Broughton International. The exhibit's project manager is Robert Steven Bianchi, Broughton's staff curator, who was assisted in concept development and loan acquisitions by Alexander von Solodkoff in obtaining European loans and by guest curator Geza von Habsburg (an internationally recognized expert on Faberge and frequent spokesperson for Faberge Co., as well as former European chairman of Christie's International) (G. von Habsburg; R.S. Bianchi; von Habsburg bio, Faberge exhibition Web site).

Peter Carl Faberge (1846-1920) oversaw a Russian company producing jewelry and decorative arts. At its height, Faberge's company employed 500 craftspeople in 12 workshops, with locations in St. Petersburg, Moscow, London, Kiev, and Odessa (von Habsburg et al., 1996; Bianchi, 2000a). The Russian company was nationalized in 1918, despite Faberge's attempt to placate the revolutionaries by encouraging formation of an internal workers committee (von Habsburg et al., 1996), and Faberge himself fled Russia. The company's trademark is carried on as Faberge Co., with reproductions produced by the German firm Victor Mayer GmbH & Co. Faberge had its greatest

success with objects reflecting Russian cultural styles but produced quite a variety of objects. The firm was chosen to exhibit in the Russian section of the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition and is best known for producing “playthings of the rich,” particularly the roughly 50 large, egg-shaped objects produced as Easter gifts for the immediate family of the last Russian tsars (von Habsburg et al., *ibid*:15). Each egg is enameled; most are also jeweled and contain an equally elaborate gift commemorating some aspect of imperial Russian life or history. The marketability of Faberge objects has been strong for over 50 years, but their prices are argued to be consistently disproportionate to their intrinsic or artistic value (Cerio, 2000; K. Kettering; A. Ruzhnikov). Buyers are drawn by the “lingering aura of the Russian imperial family” that patronized Faberge (Parker, 1996)--the mystique of Nicholas II, the last Russian tsar, and the drama of his family’s death at the hands of revolutionaries.

Curation of a Faberge exhibit can take a variety of approaches, and has over the years. Exhibitions have tended to focus on celebrities associated with the objects in the form of collectors (Faberge in America, organized in 1996 by the San Francisco Museum of Fine Arts) or original owners (Forbes Collection), or on examples of a single type of object, such as the small stone animals or the potted “flowers” crafted from a variety of mostly semi-precious materials. Collections also specialize, sometimes to the extent of focusing on a single object type, such as clocks or picture frames or cigarette cases (John Traina Collection). The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts renovated its Faberge gallery by providing extensive historical context for each object and displaying the objects to showcase their three-dimensional sculpture form, when possible (Curry, 1999; D. Noyes). Focus on Faberge’s place in the history of decorative arts or the almost mass production inferred by 500 pairs of hands has been limited to scholarly publications (K. Kettering). The Broughton Faberge exhibition touches on this less usual approach, demonstrating the objects inspiring some Faberge designs and products made by Faberge’s contemporaries, giving visitors a sense of contemporary decorative arts.

Broughton’s is the largest Faberge exhibition ever compiled, gathering roughly 1,000 objects from over 25 private lenders, 5 dealers and private companies, and two Russian national museums at a cost of roughly \$10 million (G. von Habsburg). The next largest Faberge exhibition, 800 objects, was curated by von Habsburg in 1995 in

Hamburg. The last U.S. exhibition was the 1996-97 tour “Faberge in America,” coordinated by the San Francisco Museum of Fine Arts, containing about 400 objects and coordinated once again by von Habsburg. Do the curatorial issues faced by (usually for-profit) blockbuster exhibitors and by traditional, non-profit museums differ?⁽⁵⁾

Museums

The International Council of Museums defines a museum as an “institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits, for purposes of study, education, and enjoyment . . .” (Malaro, 1994:146) . Broughton International certainly performs some of those functions at the Riverfront Arts Center, though it is more an exhibit stopover than what is usually thought of as an academic institution. Broughton’s Florida International Museum served a similar role. Broughton staff refer to their institution as an alternative to a “traditional museum.” It’s not very clear what underlies such a non-traditional museum, and there are serious implications to establishing an institution as “different,” perhaps without focusing on centuries of lessons about public expectations and responsibilities.

Traditional museums have an unquestioned academic component, evolving from what has at various stages been a university or research organization. Publicly communicating information is grounded in the museum’s Ancient Greek origins. The American Association of Museums, like the International Council of Museums, notes that museums are compelled to advance an understanding of the human experience. With “[m]useums [as] public spaces devoted to engaging the public in learning, in disseminating knowledge” (Pitman, 1999:14), they have a responsibility to convey as thorough and accurate a story as possible. Printing, such as in a catalogue, lends information from any source an air of authenticity. What’s more, museums are obliged to recognize their particular influence on the public, which puts great store in statements from or even impressions given by the museum about objects in its collection or its displays. Even more, museums must be aware of “the notion that exhibitions are more difficult to argue with than lectures or written texts” (Pitman, *ibid*:46).

Partly because of their power to influence the public even unintentionally, museums are legally expected to

“serve public and educational purposes and have a distinctive fiduciary role of protecting national and local treasures for future generations.” (Kotler and Kotler, 1998: 264). Broughton in fact prides itself on academic efforts and refers to the college-level training provided to volunteers and teachers participating in school outreach programs (R. Bianchi, e-mail). Discussions of blockbuster exhibitors invariably mention educational benefits, and the exhibitions often include student programs. At the same time, it is clear that the Broughton organization, at least, disregards some practices established to insulate integrity in traditional museums. For-profits such as Broughton have no such standards or obligations, which is not necessarily a comment on their behavior, but a simple statement of fact. Broughton certainly has the option of behaving as it chooses; a non-profit museum wishing to maintain its standing does not. The obligation of blockbuster organizers is to entertain the public and to reward investors.

Museums are considered trust institutions, and must put the interests of the museum, including preservation of the collection, ahead of any benefit to an individual other than reasonable payment for work or expenses. Income-producing activities must also benefit the institution, and U.S. tax laws impose stiff penalties for any museum overindulging in unrelated business income. In short, by fulfilling its legal, public obligations, the museum preserves a non-profit status that allows it to accept tax-deductible contributions from donors and that releases the institution from paying taxes on museum-related income. Museums depend on such financial assistance, particularly as expenses have increased. On a practical level, lenders rely on a museum’s loyalty to its public responsibility. Lenders have significant financial and emotional investment in the objects made available, and they investigate exhibitors carefully before agreeing to participate in an exhibition (M. Schaffer). To quote one collector, lending is gratifying but it “is a little frightening. . . . Because it isn’t about . . . [insurance]. It’s always a question of ‘I’m letting my child out of the house’” (J. Rivers, recorded message). Rivers literally repeats the fiduciary responsibility constraining museums--the Common Law responsibility to care for their collections and institutions as though children in their trust. Ironically, while her 1996 loan to “Faberge in America” was protected by such responsibilities, her current loan to the Broughton show has no such protections. (There are, of course, other incentives motivating exhibitors--the terms of their contracts with lenders, and the desire to foster goodwill and encourage future loans, personal integrity.)

Another serious difference is that blockbuster exhibitors choose subjects and speak to the public from a narrow range of possibilities. Success for blockbuster organizers is the largest possible crowd. On the contrary, museums are obligated as public institutions to serve the entire community and all its diverse sub-communities. Charles Alan Watkins (1992) notes that “while certain exhibition concepts are attractive to business and receive easy funding, other topics, particularly those dealing with minority and women’s issues, are not attractive to corporate decision makers, [and] are difficult to complete.” They play an important role in giving those communities a voice.

These disparate roles complicate cooperation between the traditional and newer museums. In the case of “Faberge,” none of the 1000 items is from a museum whose collection was featured in the 1996 show, though the museums were asked to participate. Members of the Broughton staff make a point of explaining that the invitation was rejected because of Broughton’s for-profit status. They are correct, but what they don’t comprehend is why. Museum directors, while anxious to publicize their institutions, have begun to question whether their trusteeship of public objects allows them to lend those objects to firms that will profit as a result, jeopardizing their trust and non-profit status (F. Fisher).

Audience Expectations

It is important to realize that a museum visitor is unaware of a museum’s level of compliance with academic or financial standards--barring egregious, outrageous behavior. What’s more, the average visitor does not distinguish between a Broughton show and a museum experience. The public assumption is that Broughton, as any “other” museum, fulfills that academic, fiduciary role. Visitors take that belief for granted; they rarely subject exhibition content to rigorous scholastic criteria. But that does not release the “museum” from its responsibility to present as accurate and comprehensive an exhibit as possible. In fact, if a visitor is inclined to absorb only a portion of the information presented, overall accuracy is all the more important.

A completely non-random survey conducted by the author was instructive: One subject had not seen the

Faberge exhibit, but defined an attractive exhibit as “those like the Vermeer show” (a internationally publicized blockbuster mounted at the National Gallery of Art). What the comment relates very honestly is the approach shared by many museum visitors. They are looking for an extra-ordinary activity, in this case, perhaps one endorsed and shared by many other people. Other subjects, asked about the Wilmington Faberge exhibit in particular, were uniform in their belief that they had visited a museum. Most were absolutely unqualified in their enthusiasm. Only a third of the subjects remarked on even the physical difficulties, though there is no doubt that the exhibition is organized in a way that makes comprehension sometimes difficult and transit literally exhausting (a cursory visit takes 2 hours, and a non-exhaustive but careful visit 3 hours). How can the response be understood?

While a museum visit has an unquestioned educational component, it is an activity chosen to fill the visitor’s leisure hours. A 1994 Toronto planning survey found only 15 percent of tourists were primarily motivated by culture (Adams, 1995).⁽⁶⁾ Visitors may discriminate in choosing which museum to visit or not to visit, but research at Winterthur Museum (Wilmington, Dela.) documents that they are probably not discriminating based on the greatest opportunity for education (Combs, 1999). Winterthur’s Visitor Research Team discovered that visitors do not see themselves as choosing between recreation and learning. Visitors define recreation as “the ability to escape from everyday life.”

The for-profit exhibition is by definition something unusual--a non-museum experience for museum goers, a quasi-museum experience for non-museum goers. The exhibition may be mounted in an actual museum or in a more unusual, perhaps more festive location, such as a convention center. The location and entry fee may lead the visitor to build an entire, day-long experience around the exhibition, “justifying” his or her effort by adding visits to nearby institutions or shops or restaurants. In turn, by charging enough money and focusing as much on atmosphere as on content, the exhibitor is able to (or must) create a dramatic, exciting, often artificial setting. This sort of design may be inappropriate to an academic museum setting. The expense is certainly not within the means of a museum budget. While the Houston Museum of Fine Arts was interested enough to serve as a stop for Broughton’s Florida-based exhibition on the Splendors of Ancient Egypt, but the institution repackaged that blockbuster in order to

increase the role, and number, of exhibition objects and to refocus on information rather than atmospherics. With exhibition fees divided among several stopovers, the cost to Houston was a third of what the same exhibition would have cost to produce in-house, even with adaptations (Rosenbaum, *ibid*). The blockbuster exhibitor focuses its finances on one, or perhaps two, exhibits at a time; if Houston took a similar approach, it would not be able to financially support the other aspects of the museum.

Specifically Curatorial Issues

Institutional responsibilities to scholarship, community representation, accuracy, have already been discussed. The curator's role in the institution is responsibility for acquisition, documentation, preservation, storage, and exhibition (Furst, 1989). Most traditional museums maintain collections as part of their public responsibilities, and a good bit of a curator's job, particularly in a smaller museum, relates to the preservation and maintenance of the collection. The most obvious difference between a traditional museum and an exhibition organization such as Broughton is that such collections management responsibilities are minimized, at least between exhibitions. Without the need to maintain a permanent collection, a blockbuster exhibitor focuses on acquiring, documenting, and exhibiting temporarily acquired objects. But a blockbuster firm upends the curator's job of exhibition design. A Broughton exhibition is not set up to tell a story built from objects so much as to create a context in which visitors can "experience" selected objects. What objects are selected, what experience is conveyed do form some sort of story, but it is the overall experience itself, the opportunity to go somewhere or do something out of the ordinary, that is paramount.

Are showmanship and scholarship mutually exclusive? Of course not. But only one or the other can have primacy, and blockbuster exhibitors clearly pick showmanship. Glen Campbell, director of the Memphis WONDERS Series, has said: "Our visitors are looking for a movie. They want a plot. They want villains. They want heroes. A regular art museum isn't that way" (Rogers, 1998). Lee Rosenbaum's article (*ibid*) argues that it is not possible to simultaneously increase crowds and scholarship, citing the lack of "scholarly overload" in texts prepared by blockbuster exhibitors and the fact that museums (such as Houston) feel the need to re-package

blockbusters by adding content. Rosenbaum describes Broughton's curator, Robert Steven Bianchi, as creating tourist attractions and suggesting that such attractions are inappropriate for traditional museums. Bianchi is quoted as suggesting that it is inefficient for both institutions to market similar "commodities." He suggests also that firms such as Broughton handle temporary blockbuster exhibitions and send them to where people are willing to pay, while museums should focus separately on objects from their permanent collection(s). Bianchi's (unquoted) subtext is that the time and expense necessary for blockbusters is detrimental to ongoing museum operations such as preservation of the permanent collection (R. Bianchi). He does not address how eliminating a way of searching out new income would benefit the permanent collection in the long run.

The Broughton approach may maximize community entertainment, but not community welfare. Making mostly for-profit blockbuster exhibitors the most visible part of the museum community risks diminishing minority voices and returning to a society where the loud voice of the majority is legitimized by public demand as the only voice worth hearing. As has been noted, for-profit exhibitors are not subject to the scholarly, professional, and legal constraints faced by traditional museums. That does not necessarily question the content of for-profit exhibitions, but the professional standards to which museums adhere are there to forestall institutional problems and strengthen public confidence. Museum curators are expected to adhere to those demanding standards, while blockbuster exhibitors seem to be studying the most troublesome aspects of traditional museums' behavior. It is certainly clear that blockbusters seem to follow a different set of standards than those guiding museums.

An example of where the groups diverge is institutional interaction with commercial lenders. Authentication of an object increases its value; display of that object in a museum increases public awareness and so the likelihood of public demand to purchase that object, inflating the value further. Broughton himself is quoted as saying that one show under consideration would have featured a collection whose owner hoped to elevate its "status, maybe from a worth standpoint" (Rosenbaum, *ibid*). He appears to say that the financial outcome is a bonus for the collector, and irrelevant to the exhibitor. That seems naive. The possibilities for collusion between commercial lenders and museums are ominous, particularly if the museum stands to benefit from the sale of any displayed

objects. While it is true that traditional museums may have benefited financially from such arrangements, these issues have been the subject of increasing debate. Most recently discussion was crystalized by the commercial terms of collector Charles Saatchi's Sensations exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum (Dobrzynski, 2000). Other discussions concern the appro-priateness of space in the Guggenheim providing an implicit endorsement to current commercial merchandise such as Armani couture (Vogel, 1998, 1999). Debate within and around the field has precipitated professional guidelines on exhibiting borrowed objects (American Association of Museums, 2000). The Association recognizes the dilemma faced by museums, noting that "borrowing . . . allows museums to provide more comprehensive exhibits and to make objects accessible that would otherwise be seen only by a few." At the same time, "Museums, as publicly accountable institutions, . . . [need to] make their actions visible and understandable to the public especially where lack of visibility could reasonably lead to appearances of conflict of interest." Some participants in the debate would argue that the guidelines do not go far enough, but their introduction is an important first statement, and their creation reveals how seriously the industry has begun taking this problem. [It must be noted that any exhibitions dis-cussed in this paper were organized before the new guidelines appeared; nor does the author know the specific terms of any loans or retail merchandising apart from what has been published about past Broughton exhibitions.]

Guest curator Geza von Habsburg is a consultant for the company, whose items are on sale in a central but very small area of the exhibition gift shop. There is certainly no evidence that the Faberge Co. has influenced the substance of the current Broughton exhibit. The firm's "connection" is stated clearly in the Broughton-published biography (von Habsburg bio, Faberge-exhibition Web site), and he is adamant that the company has had no say on the content of this or his previous exhibitions. (Whether the public interest in Faberge is promoted by the company and by such exhibitions is a different issue, but the truth is that the public is indeed interested.) A more troublesome issue is that several of the 30 collections lending to "Faberge" belong to private dealers and that Russian antiques are sold in the exhibition gift shop--a separate area, but clearly connected to and sharing staff with the "main" shop. The antiques on sale belong to Andre Ruzhnikov, a California dealer who has loaned several objects that are exhibited in the show itself, on the cover of an exhibition publication, and on the exhibition Web site. Broughton's exhibition

site contains a link to Ruzhnikov's company site, though not to the "pages" for individual items. The Broughton catalogue mentions Ruzhnikov as the owner of several objects, with no mention of his profession. Interestingly, exhibition publicity including pictures of his objects refer to him simply as a "private collector." (It is possible that Ruzhnikov's role has been intentionally minimized by Broughton. On the other hand, postcards on sale include one completely mis-identifying Forbes as the owner of a Ruzhnikov brooch (A. Ruzhnikov)--unlikely to be an intentional error.) Ruzhnikov links his Web site back to the site for "Faberge." His object descriptions have not been updated to cite the Broughton show, but he plans such an update (A. Ruzhnikov) and does cite the 1996 museum-organized exhibition that included the same objects. These objects have not been sold as a result of their 1996 exposure, but there is no way to judge whether or when their prices changed. Ruzhnikov describes the exhibited objects as being part of his private collection, but notes that they could be sold for the right price. It's no wonder that Broughton staff see the "unfriendliness" of "traditional" museums as sour grapes and specifically cite commercial activities by the Guggenheim, among others. Nevertheless, Broughton's arrangement follows a troublesome museum tradition.

Broughton has always been heavily dependent on gift shop sales, and museums are surely jealous of the retail income implicit in the Riverfront Center's design. The Riverfront Arts Center includes 8,000 square feet of retail space, and that space is important for any stopovers on an exhibition tour, which are expected to provide similar footage. Traditional museums offer about 500 commercial square feet (on average) (M. Broughton). This has proved one of the difficulties in finding a second location for the exhibit. Non-profit museums can rarely afford that much space and must be careful to limit the tax bite for income derived from business not related to their central, academic purpose.

Given the need to recoup significant costs and Broughton's heavy dependence on gift shop sales, it is hard to believe that Broughton does not expect some sort of compensation from the sales in the antiques section of the gift shop. This creates an unusual situation: If, as Broughton pointed out, exhibition can boost the market value of exhibited (or similar) objects, commercializing of exhibition objects raises questions about whether exhibition

content has been colored in order to maximize retail profits. There is certainly no evidence that exhibition content has been compromised, merely that the situation raises questions. The situation is manipulated to take advice of exhibit visitors, who are invited to buy relatively undocumented antiques from a museum gift shop, because of public investment in the authority of museum statements. The sales volunteers do not avow particular expertise about the antiques, relying on a brief typed listing for information about individual items; no dealer or consigner's name is evident, nor are the volunteers aware that the seller is not a "local collector." It cannot be ignored that the antiques include objects produced by companies or artists mentioned in the exhibit (such as Faberge and Ovchinnikov) and that visitors have just spent 2-3 hours learning about the importance and rarity of such objects.

Once again, this is a difference in sensitivity. Those connected with Broughton are more likely to see things without the concerns of the museum industry. The public's right to see beautiful objects must be preserved and maximized; museums are arrogant to limit the number of such objects in their exhibitions (A. Ruzhnikov); public access to gift shop items has no "ethical" considerations; museums are hypocritical to question any of Broughton's profit-making potential. True enough to some extent, but not the whole story. In fact, museums are "hampered" by their permanent collections and mission statements. There may be financial reasons for limiting exhibition size. (The financial result of low attendance for "Faberge" may be an object lesson for those not watching expenses.)

Finance

Curators have a responsibility to work within the financial limits of their institution, that is, within an institutional budget. At the same time, exhibits are the public face presented by a museum, and in some sense are a marketing tool for the institution. With that in mind, curators must produce a money-making product; they have responsibility for drawing an audience. Each exhibit really must score a home run.

Broughton staff do echo museum staff in assigning successful shows the task of paying for less successful shows (M. Broughton), but the financial responsibilities of an exhibition have enormous implications for blockbuster exhibitors such as Broughton. At \$8-10 million a show, lack of success carries a heavy price tag that even a

successful show may not be able to make up for. Not enough burden for a curator? Broughton has positioned itself (as have other blockbuster exhibitors) as a tool for urban revitalization. Successful exhibitions do not just support less successful exhibitions, they support the renovation of entire civic communities. An important lesson is that civic planners and officials are not so generous as to allow for the occasional unsuccessful show. While Broughton saw its (less successful) show of Japanese ceramics as its most beautiful installation, Wilmington's Riverfront Development Corporation was quickly realizing the financial risks associated with what they may have originally seen as a sure thing. Blockbusters require huge advance expenses, they tie up exhibition space for 4-6 months, and they are difficult to market because they make the same demands of space and time on any stopover location. Wilmington has decided that a more economical approach may be to pay the cost of a traveling exhibition developed elsewhere (M. Purczycki). The only thing that would have forestalled that decision would have been an uninterrupted series of successful blockbusters. That pressure, combined with the collections management challenges of such huge shows, can't help but color the curatorial role. Blockbuster curators literally cannot afford to quibble about academic questions or minority voices; they need to pack people in--the more the better.

Traditional museum curators are unlikely to draw the same crowds if they focus more on scholarship than on showmanship. But even with a similar response, traditional museums benefit less from the same number of visitors. With non-museum, blockbuster exhibitors, income goes primarily to two places--to pay for the exhibition costs and to reward company owners with profits. The traditional museum must pay for exhibition costs plus all the expenses of supporting and conserving a collection not included in that exhibition. The equation demands that museum exhibitions, however large, must be more economical than commercial exhibitions. What's more, if commercial firms are mounting more expensive exhibitions (and, more importantly, if they continue to support those expenses with significant civic or corporate financing), less financing will be available to the museum, regardless of its dependence on public financing and its role of service to the public. The museum will never be able to offer investors the possibility of recouping some of their expense as profit; it may not be able to reach the same measure of audience success. A successful blockbuster exhibitor may attract revenue equal to a sports franchise, but Broughton's communities have spent a lot of money that might otherwise service the community directly--perhaps in

part by funding traditional museums.

In addition to making less money available to museums, blockbuster organizations may boost exhibit costs. Whereas museums traditionally borrow objects by arranging for reciprocal loans, the blockbuster exhibitors borrow from institutions outside the U.S. in exchange for cash payments (sometimes going toward renovation of objects being loaned). Like the object-for-object loans, the new object-for-cash process was innovated by the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Rosenbaum, *ibid*), but has been picked up by the blockbuster exhibitors, who obviously have no collections of their own to offer. Broughton, for example, has developed an arrangement with the Hermitage Museum of Russia (Rogers, 1995; G. von Habsburg). Museums that are collection-rich but cash-poor may find themselves closed out of the loan market if foreign institutions insist on such arrangements across the board. There is evidence of continuing arrangements far beyond the financial capacity of most traditional museums: the British Museum has arranged to provide materials to collection-less WONDERS; the Prado (and previously Versailles) arranged to lend materials to the collection-less Mississippi Commission for International Cultural Exchange (WONDERS and Jackson, Miss., Web sites).

There is one more philosophical aspect to institutional financing. As noted earlier, public, non-profit museums are strictly limited in the sort of income they generate and how that income is used. The public interest is paramount and institutional arrangements are to be kept transparent in order to ensure public trust in the institutional priorities. Private, for-profit companies have no such restrictions. In fact, Broughton has had a number of unusual financing arrangements, with a reluctance to agree to a traditional salaried position. In St. Petersburg, Broughton received a monthly fee (\$80,000) as well as a large percentage of gross income (93 percent of restaurant sales, a percent of gift shop sales reported variously as either 10-20 or 80-90 percent) (Evertz, *ibid*; Aschof, 1996; Rosenbaum, *ibid*). Those amounts were used to cover staff salaries, retail inventory, and restaurant improvements; travel and expenses were reimbursed separately, while exhibit expenses were covered by a line of credit and expected to be repaid by exhibit income (Aschof, *ibid*). When later exhibits produced less-than-hoped-for attendance, the Florida International Museum renegotiated Broughton's terms (\$93,000/month, 93 percent of gross

restaurant sales, 50 percent of net gift shop sales) (Rosenbaum, *ibid*). Nonetheless, the institution developed a deficit as high as \$12 million by late 1996 (Troxler, 1998), and the private individual providing the museum's line of credit had to write off \$8 million (Gazella, *ibid*). The non-profit Florida International Museum's willingness to risk a contract so beneficial to a staff person and to that person's family corporation may be the best indication of St. Petersburg's economic reliance on exhibitions for funding redevelopment. Wilmington's Riverfront Development Corporation wrote a more restrictive deal, but spent millions for renovation of an exhibition space and, again, underestimated the risk of low attendance. Wilmington established a \$1 million grant for each exhibit plus a \$2 million loan for each exhibit, to be repaid from the first 40 percent of gross ticket sales and the first 20 percent of gross retail sales. Broughton was to front any expenses above the \$2 million and pay rent plus utilities, in return for exclusive rights to lease and an obligation to program the Riverfront Center (Broughton v. Riverfront Development Corp.). Despite a successful initial exhibition, the costs proved far beyond RDC's estimation. Conflicts over programming and financing led Broughton to sue RDC and for RDC to countersue ("Newport Firm's . . .," 1999). The case was resolved out of court, but has resulted in Broughton ending its exhibition schedule after three rather than the contracted five exhibitions (J. Broughton; M. Purczycki; "Museum Promoter . . .," 2000). The Riverfront Center will be maintained as an exhibition space but used to house contracted traveling exhibits rather than to stage exhibitions financed in-house (M. Purczycki).

Reactions

There is no question that Broughton and other blockbuster organizers have produced exhibitions that would not have otherwise been staged. They have given individuals and whole communities the chance to see objects not otherwise available to them. Public response would indicate that these are objects people wanted to see--people in the local communities; people travelling in bus tours from communities throughout the United States. Broughton fills a service of sorts, regardless of whether the public is served in the most informative way possible and whether similar exhibit subjects would have been presented in Broughton's absence.

The financial drain and the possible homogenizing effect of such organizations has already been discussed.

What underlies that discussion is that blockbuster organizations succeed because of the public's trust in traditional museums, because of the research done in traditional museums. For-profit exhibit and blockbuster organizers may indeed perform to the academic and ethical standards of traditional museums, but there is no constraint that they will continue to do so. When for-profit exhibitors take on any of the fiduciary responsibilities assigned to museums, they are doing so of their own free will and as a result of decisions by individual staff members. If what these exhibitors are doing is an extension of the public trust performed by traditional museums, there is something quite unnerving about the public's need to rely on the good will of individual staff members.

The museums who in fact are subject to fiduciary responsibilities appear to be unsure about how to treat blockbuster organizers, and particularly for-profits, such as Broughton. As noted, the Houston Museum of Fine Arts paid to have one of Broughton's Florida exhibits make a Texas stop (Rosenbaum, *ibid*). A recent presentation on blockbusters to the Museum Trustees Association elicited little discussion (F. Fisher). The truth is that museum boards salivate over the income potential of blockbusters, and may put increasing pressure on curators to "produce." But it is also true that traditional museums may not be able to compete with for-profits such as Broughton unless they compromise the scholastic and perhaps even the public nature of the museum. Equally unfortunate would be if the public became so used to atmospheric travelling blockbuster exhibitions that they eschewed smaller, "quieter" exhibitions and reduced their support for permanent collections perhaps focused on the local community (Mintz, 1994). Museums should not assume that any problems currently facing the Broughton organization indicate an end to the era of for-profit blockbusters. Broughton survived St. Petersburg's reorganization. Despite a two-year hiatus, the older WONDERS series continues without controversy to produce exhibits impacting the Memphis area and travelling to other locations around the United States.⁽⁷⁾ The younger Mississippi Commission plays a role in a huge 2001 tourism campaign. The questions raised by such organizations are going to continue, and communities need to be aware of what they are trading for financial benefit. Perhaps Ann Mintz should have the last word that: "Museums have a unique mission, a particular place in our society, and an irreplaceable resource: collections of real, meaningful objects that support educational goals. Compromising this mission, or ignoring these resources, would ultimately be a greater threat than any competition from the entertainment industry" (Mintz, *ibid*:35).

Postscript

The author has tried to maintain objectivity but confesses to being dissatisfied with the Broughton show, despite the opportunity to see so much of the Faberge oeuvre and its artistic context. Broughton is well aware of scoring a coup with having the largest exhibition of Faberge objects ever staged (1000 objects, beyond the previous record of 800 objects). That size strains a visitor's ability to absorb information (whether visually or textually). Regardless of one's belief in museum research on visitor response, it is a simple fact that 2-4 hours on one's feet is exhausting.

The exhibition's organization sometimes makes the visitor's task even more difficult. Object labels were presented in a vertical list, yet described objects arrayed on a horizontal plane. It was not always easy to match the appropriate text and object pairs. Objects and text in one room were sometimes intended as a comparison to objects several rooms away. Text and audio tour descriptions of enameled and Russian art objects were organized by artist, but objects by one artist were not always segregated from those by other artists. It was difficult to appreciate the individual differences distinguishing the best of those artists or distinguishing between those artists working for and competing with the Faberge workshop.⁽⁸⁾ Labeling occasionally seemed inaccurate--room 2 in particular had a number of cases with objects missing, mislabeled, or mis-placed.⁽⁹⁾ The style of labeling throughout was sometimes unclear in distinguishing objects available from Faberge and those from "outside," particularly in rooms 1 (inspirations) and 8 (religious art). The story told in room 10 was much clearer, because that room was organized to segregate objects from different Faberge competitors. Wall texts made passing mention of artistic terms (e.g., Art Nouveau) or cultural terms (e.g., kovsh--a traditional Russian ladle) with little added explanation, though the artistic terms in particular could have referred to specific objects on display. The curriculum guide addresses many of these questions, but neither it nor any other supplemental material was available inside the exhibition space.

Other aspects of the exhibition were enormously informative. The variety of Faberge's sources was

striking: carved animals drew on Japanese netsuke carvings; figurines drew on 17th-century Italian sculpture; non-traditional shapes based on ordinary Russian objects can be found a century earlier; and there were wonderful contemporary enamellists (such as Pavel Ovchinnikov) not employed by the Faberge firm (von Habsburg et al., 1996). The exhibition also gave a glimpse of Faberge's world. Faberge's competitors were far more conscience of experimentation and changes in decorative art styles. Innovative shapes and techniques from Louis Comfort Tiffany or Rene Lalique can hardly be compared to the Faberge oeuvre that continued to produce so much in an older and more elaborate, somewhat Imperial, style. Rival Louis Cartier actually produced items intended to copy some of the Faberge specialties (such as artificial flowers) but made a point of using fine gems, and the examples seem to show Cartier's merchandise as the finer and more delicate. Certainly the Faberge objects are lovely, and many are fascinating in their inventiveness and detail, but it no longer seems appropriate to think of the firm's output as unique or as leading others in the same field.

NOTES

- (1) The directors of Broughton International are: James E. Broughton, Kay T. Broughton, James E. Broughton Jr., Mark D. Broughton, Matthew S. Broughton, and Brooke A. Delucia (Dun & Bradstreet, 2000). It is unusual in museum circles for an institution (the Florida International Museum) to have contracted with a company so strongly linked to the family of the museum director.
- (2) Broughton's comparison between exhibition and professional sports profitability is similar to a comparison made by the St. Petersburg Times, who reported that the successful 1998 Titanic exhibit "drew a third as many people as the inaugural season of the Tampa Bay Devil Rays, at only a fraction of the cost and civic angst" (Troxler, 1998).
- (3) Delaware is not the only community explicitly pinning urban redevelopment to an exhibition program. USA Today described the phenomenon of the Mississippi Commission for International Cultural Exchange hosting a \$10 million exhibition on Versailles supported by \$2 million in funding from the poorest state in the U.S. One local restaurateur succinctly attributes success for such a large-scale project to "hav[ing] a city that is needy and cries out for it and will really go to great lengths to embrace it and make it work" (Zaroya, 1998).
The Memphis WONDERS series began with a \$4 million city grant and continuing loans, but has repaid much of that financing. In the early 1990's, the city's earnings were estimated at \$3.54 in related tax revenue for every \$1.00 of investment it has made toward WONDERS (Rosenbaum, 1998).
St. Petersburg's Florida International Museum has had millions of dollars of county support during and since Broughton's tenure. The museum recently requested funding at the state level, and was refused. The additional funds would have allowed for an outpost of the Smithsonian institution featuring a private collection of Kennedy materials. The non-profit museum appears to continue as an exhibition site only.
- (4) The name "Faberge" is used here (and generally elsewhere) to refer to the decorative arts firm rather than to the individual(s) in charge of the firm.
- (5) This paper uses the term "for-profit" to refer to the blockbuster exhibitors that are in fact only one type of for-profit exhibition company. Companies such as Exhibits USA or the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Services produce small exhibitions that are marketed to museums and so focused on meeting museum standards in academic content, size, and price. What is described in this paper would be more accurately referred to with Rosenbaum's (ibid) description--a "blockbuster mill."
- (6) Winterthur's discovery that education was not paramount repeats survey results from Lord Cultural Resources Planning and Management. Tourist motivations were revealed as: 15 percent, primarily cultural; 30 percent partly cultural; 15 percent, non-cultural, with culture seen as an adjunct; 20 percent, non-cultural, with culture seen as a serendipitous benefit; 15 percent, non-cultural (i.e., no interest in culture) (Adams, 1995).
- (7) The Memphis WONDERS series has developed very differently from Broughton International. WONDERS, which appears to be organized as a nonprofit, averages fewer than 300 objects per summertime exhibition (WONDERS Web site). WONDERS' last two exhibits drew a relatively low attendance (under 200,000) and there has been no exhibit since January 1999. A new exhibit--with the "reliable" theme of Egyptian objects--is advertised for summer 2001. The relative stability of WONDERS may relate to its smaller scope, ensuring its ability to market exhibitions to other cities. In addition, the series was contracted to use local merchants to the extent possible (Robertshaw, 1995, 1998; Shepard, 1998), supporting the local community and thus strengthening popular support.
- (8) The distinction between artists working for and in competition with Faberge can be elusive, since the firm was purchasing some objects made outside its workshops. Ovchinnikov, for example, produced objects for the Ruckert firm. Some objects were sold under Ruckert's name, but Faberge purchased some Ruckert objects to resell.
- (9) The author visited the exhibit in October 2000, over 1 month into a 6-month run. Exhibition volunteers reported,

when asked, that some objects had not arrived. Both the timing and the comments would seem to belie any explanations that errors were due to the early, shakeout stage of the exhibit (R.S. Bianchi).

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. Donald. 1995. "Cultural Tourism: The Arrival of the Intelligent Traveler." Museum News (November/December):32+.
- Alexander, Victoria D. 1996. Museums & Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship, and Management. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [American Association of Museums] 1994. Code of Ethics for Museums. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- 2000. "Guidelines on Exhibiting Borrowed Objects." Museum News (November/December):54-5.
- Anderson, David. 1992. "Museums at a Time of Change." Pp. 159-66 in Meeting the Arts. Paris: ICOM.
- Aschof, Susan. 1996. "Museum has No Plans for Show after 'Alexander.'" St. Petersburg Times (City & State):1B, 20 August. [Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe]. Available: <http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe> [17 October 2000].
- Bianchi, Robert Steven (Director of Academic and Curatorial Affairs, Broughton International). Electronic correspondence with author, 16 and 20 November 2000.
- Bianchi, Robert Steven. 2000a. Faberge: An Introduction. St. Petersburg, Fla.: Broughton International Publications.
- 2000b. Faberge: Imperial Craftsman and His World. Exhibition Album. London: Booth-Clibborn Editions.
- [Associated Press]. 2000. "Briefs from Dover and Wilmington." Associated Press Newswires, 4 February. [Westlaw]. Available: <http://web2.westlaw.com>. [3 November 2000].
- Broughton International, Inc., v. Riverfront Development Corporation of Delaware. Civil Action No. 1737400C, Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware, New Castle County, 19 August 1999
- Broughton, James E. (Pres., Broughton International). Telephone interview with author, 3 November 2000.
- Broughton, Matthew (V.P. Operations, Broughton International). Telephone interview with author, 10 November 2000.
- Brown, Carolyn Spencer. 1998. "Czar Attractions." Washington Post 28 October.
- Carlson, Pam. 1998. "Corporate Capital Tries Trading Pinstripes for Party Hats." Christian Science Monitor 29, no.10, sec.7:3. [FirstSearch, no. 99-32491]. Available: <http://newfirstsearch.dedip.oclc.o...> [14 October 2000].
- Cerio, Gregory. 2000. "On the Block: From Russia with Luster." House & Garden (August):30+.
- Combs, Amber Auld (School Services Assistant, Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library). Telephone interview with author. 1 December 2000.
- 1999. "Why Do They Come? Listening To Visitors at a Decorative Arts Museum." Curator: The Museum Journal vol. 42, no. 3 (July):186-197.
- Curry, David Park. 1999. Gallery Guide: "Faberge." Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond, Va.. Daedalus (America's Museums, Summer 1999):33-56.
- [National Governors Association] 1998. "Delaware Governor Steers Brownfields Renaissance." NGA Online, 5 October. Available: <http://www.nga.org/Releases/PR-05October1998DEBrownfield.htm>. [3 November 2000].
- Dobrzynski, Judith H. 2000. "A Possible Conflict by Museums in Art Sales." The New York Times (Arts/Cultural Desk), 21 February. [Online].
- [Dun & Bradstreet]. 1999. D&B Directory of Service Companies, 2000. Murray Hill, N.J.: Dun & Bradstreet.
- 2000. Dun and Bradstreet Reference Book of American Business, vol. 662 (1st quarter 2000). Murray Hill, N.J.: Dun & Bradstreet.
- Evertz, Mary. 2000. "Storms Follow Rainmaker to Delaware." St. Petersburg Times (Floridian), 30 April. [Online] Available: [wysiwyg://41/http://www.sptimes.com...oridian/Storms_follow_rainmak.shtml](http://www.sptimes.com...oridian/Storms_follow_rainmak.shtml). [12 October 2000].
- Fisher, Frederick J. (Director, Hillwood Museum and Gardens). Telephone interview with author, 29 November 2000.
- Furst, Hans Jorg. 1989. "Material Culture Research and the Curation Process." In Susan M. Pearce, ed., Museum

Studies in Material Culture, 98-111. Leicester: University of Leicester.

- Gazella, Katherine. 1997. "New Russia Museum Tour has Familiar Director." St. Petersburg Times (City & State):3B, 17 September. [Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe]. Available: <http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe> [17 October 2000].
- Gilmer, Bryan. 2000. "Museum Won't Get \$1-Million." St. Petersburg Times (Tampa Bay), 31 May. [Online]. Available: [wysiwyg://125/http://www.sptimes.co...ampaBay/Museum_won_t_get_1_mi.shtml](http://www.sptimes.com/...ampaBay/Museum_won_t_get_1_mi.shtml). [12 October 2000].
- Gross, Michael. 1998. "Thomas Hoving: Reinventing the Museum." New York 31(13) (6 April):81.
- Harris, Neil. 1999. "The Divided House of the American Art Museums." See Daedalus, 33-56.
- Kettering, Karen L. (Assoc. Curator, Hillwood Museum). Interview with author. Washington, D.C., 17 November 2000.
- Kotler, Neil, and Philip Kotler. 1998. Museum Strategy and Marketing: Designing Missions, Building Audiences, Generating Revenue and Resources. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Malaro, Marie C. 1994. Museum Governance. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- McDonald, John. 1992. "Death of the Blockbuster?" In Marketing the Arts, 167-77. Paris: ICOM.
- McLean, Kathleen. 1999. "Museum Exhibitions and the Dynamics of Dialogue." See Daedalus, 83-107.
- Mintz, Ann. 1994. "That's Edutainment." Museum News (November/December):32-5.
- "Museum Promoter Will Cut Short Delaware Shows." St. Petersburg Times (South Pinellas) 10 February 2000 [Westlaw search].
- "Newport firm's show headed to Riverfront." 1999. New Castle Business Ledger (Business News), October. [Online] Available: <http://www.ncbl.com.archive/10-99biznews.html>. [13 November 2000].
- Noriega, Chon A. "On Museum Row: Aesthetics and the Politics of Exhibition." See Daedalus, 33-56.
- Noyes, David (Designer, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts). Telephone interview with author, 7 December 2000.
- Parker, Harry S., III. 1996. "Foreword." In Geza von Habsburg, et al. Faberge in America, 7. San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.
- Pitman, Bonnie. 1999. "Muses, Museums, and Memories." See Daedalus, 1-32.
- Purczycki, Michael (Exec. Director, Riverfront Development Corp.). Telephone interview with author, 21 November 2000.
- Rivers, Joan (exhibition lender). Telephone message in response to inquiry from author, 13 November 2000.
- Robertshaw, Nicky. 1995. "Wang's World: Importer Oversees Wonders Gift Shop." Memphis Business Journal 16(40, Sec. 1):3. [Library of Congress DataTime search].
- Robertshaw, Nicky. 1998. "Merchandising Wonders." Memphis Business Journal 20(1, Sec. 4):3, 8 May. [Library of Congress DataTime search]
- Rogers, David K. 1998. "New Museum Exhibit's Lure Is Mystery." St. Petersburg Times (Tampa Bay), 12 October. [Online]. Available: http://www.sptimes.com/TampaBay/101298/New_Museum_exhibits_a_.html. [12 October 2000].
- 1999a. "Museum has Smithsonian Hopes." St. Petersburg Times (Tampa Bay), 2 March. [Online]. Available: http://www.sptimes.com/News/30299/TampaBay/Museum_has_Smithsonia.html. [12 October 2000].
- 1999b. "Museum Wants City to Buy Land." St. Petersburg Times (South Pinellas), 26 February. [Online]. Available: http://www.sptimes.com/News/22699/SouthPinellas/Museum_wants_city_to_.html. [12 October 2000].
- Rogers, Patrick. 1995. "Circus of the Czars." Newsweek 125(13 February):76-7.
- Rosenbaum, Lee. 1998. "Blockbusters, Inc." Art in America (Winter):45-53.
- Ruzhnikov, Andre (exhibition lender; dealer--Russian Arts). Telephone interview with author, 9 December 2000.
- Schaffer, Mark (exhibition lender; dealer--A La Vieille Russie). Telephone interview with author, 30 November 2000.
- Shepard, Scott. 1998. "Authentic Russian Items Aren't Cheap for Wonders Exhibition Gift Shop." Memphis Business Journal 20(1, Sec. 4):3. [Library of Congress DataTime search].
- Sills, James H. (Mayor of Wilmington). FY 2001 Budget Address. [Online] Available:

- <http://www.ci.wilmington.de.jus/pressreleases/pr0003300.htm>. [3 November 2000].
- Troxler, Howard. "Museums Put Gold Streets to Shame." St. Petersburg Times (Tampa Bay), 16 November. [Online]. Available: http://www.sptimes.com/TampaBay/111698/Museums_put_gold_stre.html. [12 October 2000].
- Victor Mayer GmbH & Co. 2000. Faberge exhibit list, 1977-2000. Electronic correspondence with author, 29 September.
- Vogel, Carol. 1998. "Latest Biker Hangout? Guggenheim Ramp." New York Times 3 August:1.
- 1999. "Armani Gift to the Guggenheim Revives Issue of Art and Commerce." The New York Times Arts/Cultural Desk. 15 December .
- Volkert, James W. 1991. "Monologue to Dialogue." Museum News (March/April):46-8.
- von Habsburg, Geza (Guest Curator, "Faberge"). Telephone interview with author, 7 November 2000.
- 1996. "Faberge in His Own Time." Antiques (March):446-455.
- von Habsburg, Geza, et al. 1996. Faberge in America. San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.
- Watkins, Charles Alan. 1992. "Fighting for Culture's Turf." Museum News (January/February):61-2.
- Weil, Stephen E. 1999. "From Being about Something to Being for Somebody: The Ongoing Transformation of the American Museum." See Daedalus, 229-258.
- Zaroya, Gregg. 1998. "Miss. Puts Itself on the Cultural Map." USA Today (Travel Guide), 23 July. [Online]. Available: <http://www.usatoday.com/life/travel/leisure/lt0327mm.htm>. [4 December 2000].

Web sites

- "Broughton Masterpiece Presentation," [Online]. Available: <http://www.broughtonmasterpiece.com>.
- "Faberge." Andre Ruzhnikov Russian Art, [Online]. Available: <http://www.russianarts.com>.
- "Faberge" Exhibition Credits, [Online]. Available: <http://www.faberge-exhibition.com>.
- "Visitor Center" for Jackson, Mississippi, [Online]. Available: <http://www.city.jackson.ms.us>.
- New Castle Business Ledger, [Online]. Available: <http://www.ncbl.com/archive/10-99biznews.html>
- "Faberge Online Exhibition," [Online]. Available: <http://www.faberge-exhibition.com>.
- St. Petersburg Times, [Online]. Available: <http://www.sptimes.com>
- USA Today, [Online]. Available: <http://www.usatoday.com>.
- "WONDERS: The Memphis International Cultural Series." [Online]. Available: <http://www.wonders.org>.